DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 373 878 PS 022 552

TITLE	Field Hearing on H.R. 6: Elementary and Secondary Education Act Reauthorization. Hearing before the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor. House of Representatives, One Hundred Third Congress, First Session (Houston, TX, May 14, 1993).
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, DC. House Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education.
REPORT NO	ISBN-0-16-044178-1
PUB DATE	94
NOTE	42p.; Serial No. 103-46.
AVAILABLE FROM	U.S. Government Printing Office, Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrators; *Educational Attitudes; Elementary School Teachers; *Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Aid; *Federal Legislation; Hearings; Program Improvement; State Officials; Superintendents
IDENTIFIERS	Congress 103rd; *Elementary Secondary Education Act; Reauthorization Legislation; Texas

ABSTRACT

These hearing transcripts present testimony concerning the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), which since 1965 has provided the bulk of federal aid to elementary and secondary schools and related programs. Much of the testimony was from Texas education officials, school administrators, and teachers who voiced opinions about the efficacy of specific programs and activities funded by the ESEA, particularly those items that they would like to see expanded or improved. Testimony was heard from: (1) Representative Gene Green; (2) the deputy director of education policy in the governor's office; (3) the executive deputy commissioner for programs and instruction, Texas Education Agency; (4) the Texas commissioner of education; (5) an official from the Texas State Board of Education; (6) two school district superintendents; and (7) a Chapter 1 educator. (MDH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

PS

FIELD HEARING ON H.R. 6: ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT REAUTHORIZATION

ED 373 878

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED THIRD CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

HEARING HELD IN HOUSTON, TX, MAY 14, 1993

Serial No. 103–46

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
78–432 CC WASHINGTON : 1994

For sale by the U.S. Government Printing Office
Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402
ISBN 0-16-044178-1

PS 022552

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan, *Chairman*

WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri
GEORGE MILLER, California
AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
THOMAS C. SAWYER, Ohio
DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey
JOLENE UNSOELD, Washington
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii
ROBERT E. ANDREWS, New Jersey
JACK REED, Rhode Island
TIM ROEMER, Indiana
ELIOT L. ENGEL, New York
XAVIER BECERRA, California
ROBERT C. SCOTT, Virginia
GENE GREEN, Texas
LYNN C. WOOLSEY, California
CARLOS A. ROMERO-BARCELO, Puerto Rico
RON KLINK, Pennsylvania
KARAN ENGLISH, Arizona
TED STRICKLAND, Ohio
RON DE LUGO, Virgin Islands
ENI F. H. FALEOMAVAEGA, American Samoa
SCOTTY BAESLER, Kentucky
ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD, Guam

WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
RICHARD K. ARMEY, Texas
HARRIS W. FAWELL, Illinois
PAUL B. HENRY, Michigan
CASS BALLENGER, North Carolina
SUSAN MOLINARI, New York
BILL BARRETT, Nebraska
JOHN A. BOEHNER, Ohio
RANDY "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM, California
PETER HOECKSTRA, Michigan
HOWARD "BUCK" McKEON, California
DAN MILLER, Florida

PATRICIA F. RISSLER, *Staff Director*
JAY EAGEN, *Minority Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan, *Chairman*

GEORGE MILLER, California
THOMAS C. SAWYER, Ohio
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
JOLENE UNSOELD, Washington
JACK REED, Rhode Island
TIM ROEMER, Indiana
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii
ELIOT L. ENGEL, New York
XAVIER BECERRA, California
GENE GREEN, Texas
LYNN C. WOOLSEY, California
KARAN ENGLISH, Arizona
TED STRICKLAND, Ohio
DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey
CARLOS A. ROMERO-BARCELO, Puerto Rico

WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
HOWARD "BUCK" McKEON, California
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
SUSAN MOLINARI, New York
RANDY "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM, California
DAN MILLER, Florida
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
JOHN A. BOEHNER, Ohio

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearing held in Houston, TX, May 14, 1993	1
Statement of:	
Salas, Beverly, Deputy Director of Education Policy, Office of the Governor; Jay Cummings, Executive Deputy Commissioner for Programs and Instruction, Texas Education Agency; and Rene Nunez, Member, Texas State Board of Education	4
Petruzielo, Frank, Superintendent of Houston ISD; M.D. Donaldson, Superintendent of Aldine ISD; and June Smith, Chapter 1 Educator, Cage Elementary School	21
Prepared statements, letters, supplemental materials, et ceteras:	
Green, Hon, Gene, a Representative in Congress from the State of Texas, prepared statement of	2
Meno, Lionel "Skip," Commissioner of Education, Texas, prepared statement of	33
Nunez, Rene, Member, Texas State Board of Education, prepared statement of	9

FIELD HEARING ON H.R. 6: ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT REAUTHORIZATION

FRIDAY, MAY 14, 1993

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY,
AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Houston, TX.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:30 a.m., at Jeff Davis High School, 1101 Quitman, Houston, Texas, Hon. Gene Green, Chairman.

Members present: Representatives Green and Woolsey.

Mr. GREEN. I want to welcome you here. I think it is so important that our congressional hearing is here at Jeff Davis. Carlos is what it is all about. I do not think we can recognize our students too much for that.

Members of the committee, ladies and gentlemen, I am pleased to be here this morning. I am also pleased to have with me Congresswoman Lynn Woolsey of California, who is also a member of our freshman class. Congresswoman Woolsey represents California's Sixth District, which is north of San Francisco. I want to thank Congressman Woolsey for making the trip to Houston and for allowing our community to be heard in Congress.

We are here this morning as part of the process of reauthorizing the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This Act is the largest Federal Education program and involves over eight billion dollars in Federal funds for education. It funds programs such as the Chapter 1 Program for Disadvantaged Children and Bilingual Education. Also included in this bill is a formula for distributing Federal Education dollars.

The first bill I filed as a Member of Congress is a bill that would change this formula to benefit States like Texas and California, who have been short-changed in Federal education funds. Texas has gained over 200,000 children eligible for additional education funds; but because we are still using 1980 population counts, the outdated formula, we have yet to receive these funds.

Currently, we have over 30 cosponsors for this bill, and I look forward to working to ensure that is part of the final bill that we are addressing here today.

Education is one of our top priorities during this Congress. The Committee on Education and Labor is expected to be one of the most active in pursuing President Clinton's domestic agenda. We

have already addressed the issue of family and medical leave, and we are continuing our work on the President's Education Reform Bill, Goals 2000.

The testimony we will hear today will be included in the information we will use to determine the course of Federal education policy. The importance of this issue is clear when we look at the consequences of our action. Without an education, a person is more likely to become involved in drugs, wind up in prison and become a liability on our society. By providing all of our children with an opportunity to have education, we level the playing field and open up endless possibilities.

Returning here to Jeff Davis reminds me of the possibilities that were opened up for me through my education here. I was a student here when the first Federal funding for education arrived. The students who walked the halls of this school deserve the best we can offer them, from both the educational opportunity and a safe and stable society. It is imperative that we live up to that commitment.

When I was here at Jeff Davis I took Spanish, like a lot of you have, but, in the last 25 years I have not. In Congress I have been in a Spanish course every morning in Washington. Of course, instead of learning Spanish like I might have learned here, I have my current teacher who is from Cuba, and I did have a teacher from Ecuador. So, hopefully we will all be learning the same Spanish. I would like to give an opening statement in Spanish. If you will forgive me, I am still a student, as most of you are.

Miembros del Comite, damas y senores. Es un placer estar con ustedes esta manana. Es un honor tambien tener con nosotros la Congresista Lynn Woolsey, del Estado de California, tambien miembra de esta nueva clase de deputados a la camara de Los Estados Unidos. La representante Woolsey representa el Distrito Numero Seis de Estado de California, norte a la Ciudad de San Francisco. Aprovecho esta oportunidad para expresar mis sinceras gracias a la Congresista Woolsey por hacer el viaje a Houston y permitir a nuestra comunidad que se oiga ante el Congreso.

Regresando aqui a Jeff Davis High School me recuerda de las puertas que se me abrieron por medio de mi educacion aqui. Fui estudiente de esta esquela quando los primeros fondos Federales se distribuyeron a los distritos escolares. Los Estudiantes que caminan por los pasillos de esta escuela de merecen lo mejor que podemos ofrecerles tanto en oportunidades educativas como en esegurar una sociedad estable y segura. Es necesario e importante que vivamos a este compromiso.

Muchas gracias.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Gene Green follows:]

STATEMENT OF HON. GENE GREEN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS

Miembros del Comite, damas y senores, es un placer estar con ustedes esta manana. Es un honor tambien tener con nosotros la Congresista Lynn Woolsey, del Estado de California, tambien miembra de esta nueva clase de deputados a la camara de Los Estados Unidos. La Representante Woolsey representa el Distrito Numero Seis del Estado de California, norte a la Ciudad de San Francisco. Aprovecho esta oportunidad para expresar mis sinceras gracias a la Congresista Woolsey por hacer el viaje a Houston y permitir a nuestra comunidad que se oiga ante el Congreso.

Regresando aqui a Jeff Davis High School me recuerda de las puertas que se me abrieron por medio de mi educacion aqui. Fui estudiente de esta escuela cuando los primeros fondos Federales se distribuyeron a los distritos escolares. Los Estudiantes que caminan por los pasillos de esta escuela se merecen lo mejor que podemos ofrecerles tanto en oportunidades educativas como en asegurar una sociedad estable y segura. Es necesario e importante que vivamos a este compromiso. Muchas gracias.

[Applause.]

Ms. WOOLSEY. That is great.

Mr. GREEN. I will get better.

I would like to ask Congresswoman Woolsey if she would like to make an opening statement.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Thank you, Mr. Green. I would like to thank you for inviting me to your great district to participate in this important hearing. I would like to thank your district for sending you to Washington, DC. He is a representative you can definitely be proud of. He is working for you day in and day out. It has been such a pleasure to serve on the Education and Labor Committee back in Washington with your representative, Gene Green, and particularly to watch his work on bilingual education, something he has just proven through example is important to him, and also Chapter 1 reform.

Gene and all of you, the interest that is shown from your district and the dedication to education reform has been inspiring to me. I join Eugene in welcoming our two distinguished panels. I am eager to discuss my favorite subject, which is coordinated services. I want to discuss this with the representative from Houston Independent School District. As I understand that district is interested in looking at providing coordinated services, social and health care services at or near some of the school sites, so that we can educate our total student and not bringing students into the classroom who are not able to learn in the first place.

I am also extremely supportive of the Chapter 1 program, seeing it as an essential tool in assisting disadvantaged children to learn basic math and reading skills. However, I think we can do and must do better in this regard. We need to fine-tune the program and look at how we are spending our dollars. I look forward to hearing from the panels today to advise us from actual experience on what we should be looking at in Washington.

Thank you.

[Applause.]

Mr. GREEN. Thank you, Congresswoman Woolsey.

Without objection, the written statements of all of the witnesses will be included in the record in their entirety.

If I could ask our first panel to step up. Sonia Hernandez, Ms. Hernandez; our State Board member, Rene Nunez. Also our Commissioner, Skip Meno, was supposed to be here, but this morning the House Education Committee is hearing testimony and considering an Education Funding Bill. He called yesterday and could not be here. In his place is Jay Cummings who is here and also Beverly Salas, who is Deputy Director of Education Policy for the Office of the Governor, Ann Richards.

Good morning. If we could start with our State Board member first?

Mr. NUNEZ. I am going to yield to the Governor's Office.

Mr. GREEN. Okay.

STATEMENTS OF BEVERLY SALAS, DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION POLICY, OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR; JAY CUMMINGS, EXECUTIVE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER FOR PROGRAMS AND INSTRUCTION, TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY; AND RENE NUNEZ, MEMBER, TEXAS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Ms. SALAS. Thank you for letting me be here. I have to start off by letting you know that we are currently in the final days of our legislative session in Austin and working furiously to come to a resolution on our school finance plan. For that reason, Sonia was not able to be here. I am glad to be here in her place.

As you know, this is a very critical issue right now in the State of Texas. We have 18 days from today to finalize our school finance plan and to come to some sort of agreed mutual plan or a State judge will close our schools. Our funding will be cut off. Obviously, the poorer districts are going to be the first ones to close down. Slowly, the State of Texas Public School Systems will all close down. That is not anything that we are inclined to want to have happen, so we are working very diligently at this point in time to come to a mutual agreement on that. I think we have some very firm plans in hand that will help us to accomplish that goal very soon.

I would like to start off by just saying that, as Deputy Director of Education Policy in the Governor's office, our commitment very generally in education are to continue to increase the opportunities for learning across the State in many varieties of ways. We are also looking at developing comprehensive workforce plans collaboratively with businesses and communities and public school systems, as well as the universities and community colleges. We are encouraging innovative methods to be employed in our schools. We also are encouraging the communities and the schools to come into cooperatives that help to facilitate not just workforce planning, but also to facilitate a kind of mentorship that will allow students to become optimal citizens in our society. I think the bottom line here we are talking about is access and equity in education.

The Governor totally supports the national education goals. I think, if you were to look at some of the current legislation that has been introduced before the House currently, you will find that many of our senators and representatives are very much working closely together this session to come up with some new legislation that are in support of the national education goals, as Texas is a part of that too.

With school readiness, we have many pieces of legislation that look at nutrition and health care that is necessary for learning. There are several programs that are currently in place and we are looking at expanding those. We are also looking at helping students be prepared by the time they come into school with proper inoculations, immunizations to schools.

School completion is another factor that we are definitely working on. Graduation rates need to increase. Dropout rates obviously need to decrease. While there are many factors that are affecting that, one of the highest factors that we have found in research that

actually affects dropout rates in high school—and the highest percentage or incidence of dropouts is around the eighth or ninth grade—and that is because it is attributed to a lack of achievement. I think that, as you look at that very closely and understand that when students do not achieve, when they are not experiencing successes in their schools where their life is being molded, they are going to drop out. I think this speaks very much to the need for new programs, innovative creative techniques to be employed within our school systems.

The fact is also that we must get them through elementary school and ready for high school before they are going to enter and stay in high school. Realistic courses that translate into employment, money and independence for students are critical variables.

We also have very much on our high-priority list is enhancing math and science, not only in elementary schools, but all the way through institutions of higher education as well. Math and science continue to be under-represented by minority groups and women. We would like to be first in the creation of new math and science careers and fields. We have been looking at employing some innovative methods for teaching math and science, for getting young students involved in math and science-related careers in high school, where they actually go out and are partnered with businesses that facilitate careers in that area.

We also have encouraged adult literacy. With our workforce changing and the needs of the economy changing, I think it is real important that adult literacy and lifelong learning become an integral part of our whole educational system. The need to train and retool individuals, adults, for the kinds of changing jobs that are going to be required, not only in this State, but across the Nation, are very important.

Along to that end also, Texas has been prepared for and continues to be preparing for the impact of the potential National American Free Trade Agreement, NAFTA, and the impact that that would have across our State. So, to that end also we have been working on some workforce planning to prepare for that.

There are a lot of exciting things happening across the State with regard to high school education and helping to prepare our youth for working, for employment, for independence. One of the most successful is the tech-prep program that we have currently being implemented. We are most pleased and encouraged at the rate and the enthusiasm with which businesses have been responding to and working with us to help implement these kinds and similar other programs.

In general, I would just like to say that Texas, like the Nation, is also challenged with trying to meet the changing needs of our demographics. I think that special programs that we have currently in place in our public school systems are in need for a change. I think most teachers agree with that. I think that, with the Individuals Disability Education Act and with Madeline Wills' Initiative for Inclusion, I think you find more and more teachers in public schools faced with having to deal with education in a different perspective than they have in the past. I think most of us believe and feel that inclusion is an important component to education. I think a part of that is demonstrated by us trying to bring

the businesses into the schools, the schools into the businesses. These pull-out, separation kinds of programs seem to be slowly indicating to us that to meet the needs, these are not the kind of programs that are being successful—found to be successful, and that we need to be diverse in the kinds of programs that we offer to our students as the student population and their needs become more diverse as well. I think we are prepared for that challenge. I think we have a lot of innovative strategies being attempted already. I think that the legislators are working very diligently also to help us in getting that going.

Thank you very much.

Mr. GREEN. Thank you.

Mr. NUNEZ. Congresswoman Woolsey and Congressman Green, thank you for this opportunity to come before you today.

I wish to introduce to you a special guest that I have in the audience, and for you—is my colleague and friend, and you representative from this District on the State Board of Education, Dr. Allen.

[Applause.]

Mr. NUNEZ. She has been a fine addition to the State Board of Education from this area.

My name is Rene Nunez. I am a member of the State Board of Education. I am Chairman of the Personnel Committee, and I am elected in District One. District One is a 26-county area from El Paso County down to Hidalgo County, 1.4 million in population. I represent over 250,000 students and 71 school districts.

Today I wish to record my appreciation to the committee, and especially to you, Congressman Green, for allowing this excellent opportunity to address the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This action reassures your constituency and the general public of your commitment to the educational welfare of all children, not only in Texas, but throughout this country.

School districts in Texas have been participating in programs enacted by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act since 1965. Because of the continuous congressional support for this, the largest federally-funded aid to public elementary and secondary education, hundreds of thousands of students have been assisted with academic success. One distinct group of students benefiting from the funds is the migrant population. As you know, from El Paso to Hidalgo, I represent the largest migrant population probably in the Nation.

In 1967, the Migrant Educational Program was established as part of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The vision of this legislation was to provide for the special educational needs of one of the neediest special populations, migrant children. Today, Texas has the second largest migrant population of any State in the United States. Texas currently serves 170,484 migrant students. Congresswoman Woolsey, your State represents the largest migrant population. So, I am very happy that you are here.

The current program in Texas focuses on goals identifying in the State Board of Education's long-range plan for ensuring that migrant students receive the additional academic assistance and support services they need to close the achievement gap between the educationally disadvantaged and the other students, the have's and the have-nots. The allocation of funds is directed at students' suc-

cess by helping to provide programs to meet the special needs of students and ensuring compliance with Federal laws.

During the 1991–1992 school year, the migrant program was offered by approximately 238 school districts. The goals of the migrant programs are to improve student achievement at all grade levels, to improve graduation rates, increase the participation rate of parents in the educational process of their children, to improve the coordination of all services delivered to migrant students.

Activities in the Migrant programs include: Supplementary instruction services which must address the priorities of oral language development, reading, writing, English, language arts and math; support services, such as: Guidance and counseling, coordinated services, health, referral services, parent involvement, attendance, identification and recruitment of migrant students; enrichment instruction to migrant students who have mastered basically skills and specialized personal training in migrant areas, mainly early childhood and graduation enrichment.

In order to serve these children with quality education programs which will improve their academic success and keep them in school, and increase the graduation rate, they must first be identified. The State Board of Education's philosophy, and that of the Texas Educational Agency is that all migrant children possible to be identified and recruited and then served with quality education.

Even though Texas has the second largest enrollment of migrant students in the Nation, with 170,000 students, reductions in Federal appropriations have resulted in a decline in State's allocations. When this decline is measured in constant dollars, today's allocation is almost half of what it was in 1980. Further reports from MSRTS indicates that during the 1990 and 1991 school year, over 29,000 Texas home-based migrant children were identified by other States, but had never been enrolled or identified by Texas schools. This undercount has cost the State of Texas an estimated $9.1 million.

To turn this around, the Agency would need to provide the educational service centers additional allocations in order to develop and implement comprehensive, innovative identification and recruitment programs for children and find practices and models specifically designed to enhance and revamp identification and recruitment programs at the education service centers or the local school district. It is important to note that these funds would not be used as additional moneys to carry out existing identification and recruitment practices which have been successful in the past.

The TEA has assured the State Board of Education that the educational service centers would be accountable for ensuring that, in accordance with all Federal and State laws, the regulations, all eligible migrant students would be identified and recruited in this program. Current Federal funds drive the efforts of hundreds of teachers, paraprofessionals, administrators and support personnel.

Program budgets for Texas includes approximately $36.6 million in funds directed to local school districts for migrant students; $4.5 million dedicated toward discretionary programs, for a total of $41.1 million directed towards federally-funded programs.

Of the $4.5 million in discretionary funds, I would like to share information on one such program, SMART project. SMART, stand-

ing for Summer Migrant Access Resources through Technology. The SMART project is designed to meet the needs of Texas migrants, regardless of the summer travel patterns and living arrangements, lending television technology and innovative instruction design. The SMART project targets two groups of students. The first group is the migrant student who remains in Texas during the summer months who will be taught either in their home or in libraries via television instruction with additional support help from locally employed teachers or facilities. The second group consists of Texas migrants who are living temporarily out of State and participate in established summer programs for migrants.

The SMART project sets out to offer program access to as many migrant students as possible by offering cost-effective instruction through technology. They are the families who are in the fields picking asparagus. The SMART project also provides students with high-quality supplement instruction to accelerate instruction through the summer months. It supports development practices for young children and involvement in parent involvement in the early childhood, improve performance on math, problem-solving for the TAAS at the elementary and middle school levels. It offers course credit for high school students.

It is generally recognized that one of the chief detriments to students' success among the children of migrant workers in the United States is the lack of instructional continuity. Moving from State to State, changing schools frequently, result in mixed and confusing curriculum requirements. The resulting pattern is a poor coordinated educational opportunity for this population. Nationally-available distance learning offers a tremendous potential in addressing this educational dilemma. Migrant students can move from school to school and still take the same curriculum from the same teacher.

In Texas large numbers of migrant students do not participate in any kind of summer program. A recent needs assessment determines that migrant students who travel out of State appear to perform at a higher level academically because of the intervention of the technology approach.

The success story that strengthens the investment dollars towards migrant children occurred this month. Seventy-two students were provided the opportunity to complete their graduation requirements. These students are native Texans, however, they are currently living in Pasco, Washington, working with their families in the asparagus fields. All 72 students needed to take the TAAS exit exam in order to receive their diploma. Coordination between the Texas Education Agency and the National Computer System arranged for the TAAS to be administered to the migrant students in Pasco, Washington. Upon mastery of these students, they will have the opportunity to complete their graduation requirements and commence with their adult lives.

Let me tell you a story of two families that came from Mexico, who came to the United States for a better way of life. The son of one and the daughter of another met and married. They had four children. The fourth did not have the pleasure of knowing his father, for the father was killed with a Saturday Night Special at a grocery store. The mother, a single parent, when being single was not popular, did her best in raising the family. The first son is a

high school dropout who sold cars for the rest of his life. The second son, also a high school dropout, did get a GED and fixed cars for the rest of his life. The daughter did graduate from high school, married in her young 20's, had three kids, is now divorced and has a decent job, but has a tough time making a living. The fourth son made it through high school, with the help of many teachers and coaches, made it through college, and became a teacher, received his Master's Degree and, with the help of teachers, friends, and loving wife, has made it.

Congressman, what I am telling you is the more things change, the more they remain the same. The story is 40 to 50 years old. We still have killings with Saturday Night Specials, we still have single parents raising the four children by themselves. We still have kids who drop out of school and high school; but once in a while, we still have the success story because of education. That success story is me. I am addressing you. I am that story.

Congressman, because of your investment in public education and your continuous confidence in educators, you are leading the country in efforts to restructure, rethink and customize programs to ensure the success of all students. On behalf of the State Board of Education and myself, I thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Nunez follows:]

STATEMENT OF RENE NUNEZ, MEMBER, TEXAS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to come before you today.

My name is Rene Nunez and I am a member of the State Board of Education, Chairman of the Personnel Committee and elected from District One.

Today I wish to record my appreciation to the committee and especially to Congressman Green, for allowing this excellent opportunity to address the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This action reassures your constituency and the general public of your commitment to the educational welfare of all children, not only in Texas, but throughout this country.

School districts in Texas have been participating in programs enacted by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act since 1965. Because of the continuous congressional support for this, the largest federally-funded aid to public elementary and secondary education, hundreds of thousands of students have been assisted towards academic success. One distinct group of students benefiting from the ESEA funds is the migrant population.

In 1967, the Migrant Education Program was established as part of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The vision of this legislation was to provide for the special educational needs of one of the neediest special populations—Migrant Children.

Today, Texas has the second largest migrant population of any State in the United States. Texas currently serves 170,484 migrant children.

The current program in Texas focuses on goals identified in the SBOE's Long Range Plan by ensuring that migrant students receive the additional academic assistance and support services they need to close the achievement gap between the educationally disadvantaged and the other students.

The allocation of funds is directed at student success by helping to provide revised programs to meet the special needs of students and ensuring compliance with Federal laws.

During the 1991–1992 school year, the Migrant Program was offered by approximately 238 Local Education Agencies (School Districts).

The goals of the Migrant Program are to:

Improve student achievement at grade levels

Improve the graduation rate

Increase the participation rate of parents in the educational process of their children and

Improve the coordination of all services delivered to migrant students.

Activities in a migrant program include:

Supplementary instructional services which must address the priorities of oral language development, reading, writing, English language arts, and math.

Support services such as: guidance and counseling, coordination of services, health referrals, parent involvement, attendance, and identification and recruitment of migrant students;

Enrichment instruction to migrant students who have mastered basically skills; and

Specialized personnel training in the migrant focus areas, namely early education and graduation enrichment.

In order to serve these children with quality education programs which will improve their academic success, keep them in school, and increase their graduation rate, they must first be identified.

The State Board of Education's philosophy and that of the Texas Education Agency is that all migrant children possible be identified and recruited and then served with quality programs.

Even though Texas has the second-largest enrollment of migrant students in the Nation, 170,000 students, reductions in Federal appropriations have resulted in a precipitous decline in the State's allocation.

When this decline is measured in constant dollars, today's allocation is almost half of what it was in 1980.

Further reports (MSRTS) indicate that during the 1990–1991 school year, over 29,000 Texas home-based migrant children were identified by other States, but had never been enrolled or identified by Texas schools.

This undercount has cost the State an estimated $9.1 million. To turn this around, the Agency would need to provide the Educational Service Centers additional allocations in order to develop and implement comprehensive, innovative I&R/Child Find practices and models specifically designed to enhance and revamp existing I&R (identify and recruit) programs at the Educational Service Centers and the Local Education Agencies (School Districts).

It is important to note that these funds would not be used as additional moneys to carry out existing I&R practices which have been unsuccessful in the past.

The TEA has assured the SBOE that ESCs would be accountable for ensuring that, in accordance with all Federal and State laws and regulations, all eligible Migrant students would be identified and recruited in the program.

Current Federal funds drive the efforts of hundreds of teachers, paraprofessionals, administrators and support personnel.

Program budgets for Texas includes approximately:

Thirty six point six million dollars in funds directed to local school districts for migrant programs.

Four point five million dollars dedicated towards discretionary programs

For a total of $41.1 million directed towards federally-funded programs.

Of the $4.5 million in discretionary funds, I would like to share information on one such program.

SMART Project—Summer Migrants Access Resources Through Technology.

The SMART project is designed to meet the needs of Texas migrant students regardless of summer travel patterns and living arrangements. Blending television technology and innovative instruction design, the SMART project targets two groups of students. The first group is migrant students who remain in Texas during the summer months who will be taught in their homes or if needed, at libraries via televised instruction with additional support help from locally employed teachers or facilitators. The second group consists of Texas students who are living temporarily out of State and participating in established summer programs for migrants.

SMART project sets out to:

Offer program access to as many migrant students as possible by offering cost-effective instruction through technology.

Provide students with high-quality supplemental instruction to accelerate instruction through summer months.

Support developmentally appropriate practices for young children and involvement of parents in early childhood.

Improve performance on math, problem-solving for TAAS at the elementary and middle school levels, and

Offer a credit course credit for high school students.

It is generally recognized that one of the chief detriments to students' success among the children of migrant workers in the United States is the lack of instructional continuity. Moving from State to State and changing schools frequently results in mixed and confusing curriculum requirements. The resulting pattern is poorly coordinated educational opportunity for this population. Nationally available distance learning offers a tremendous potential in addressing this educational di-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

lemma. Migrant students can move from school to school and still take the same curriculum from the same teacher.

In Texas, large numbers of migrant students do not participate in any kind of summer program. A recent needs assessment determines that migrant students who travel out of State appear to perform at a higher level academically because of the intervention of the technology approach.

The success story that strengthens the investment of Federal funds towards migrant children occurred this month. Seventy-two students were provided the opportunity to complete their graduation requirements. These students are native Texans, however, they are currently in Pasco, Washington, working with their families in the fields picking asparagus. All 72 students needed to take the TAAS exit examination in order to receive their diploma. Coordination between the Texas Education Agency and the National Computer Systems arranged for the TAAS to be administered to the migrant students in Pasco, Washington. Upon mastery these students will have the opportunity to complete their graduation requirements and commence with their adult lives.

Congressmen, because of your investment in public education and your continuous confidence in educators, you are leading the country in efforts to restructure, rethink and customize programs to assure the success of all students.

On behalf of the Texas State Board of Education, I thank you.

[Applause.]

Mr. GREEN. Thank you.

Mr. Cummings.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Congressman Green, and Congresswoman Woolsey, I thank you for the opportunity to be before you to represent the Texas perspective regarding education and the pending reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended by the Hawkins-Stafford Act of 1988.

As mentioned earlier, Commissioner Skip Meno expressed his deep regret at not being here to testify on behalf of the State. As you know, he is involved in those very serious deliberations in Austin regarding school finance equity.

My name is Jay Cummings. I am the Executive Deputy Commissioner for Programs and Instruction at the Texas Education Agency. The close alignment of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs with the current education reform initiative, shows how necessary a comprehensive education agenda is for boosting student performance. In this spirit, I encourage you to make adequate use of the Federal Government's potential to promote educational equity and excellence for all students through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The Federal Government has significant influence on the course of public education in the United States. Nearly $10 billion a year is appropriated for Federal elementary and secondary education programs. Federal funds and Federal requirements drive the efforts of thousands of teachers, administrators and support personnel, resulting in millions of hours of effort. We can ill-afford to direct these efforts in ways that fail to positively influence educational excellence and equity.

Past Federal efforts are to be commended for leveling educational opportunities for students with disadvantaged circumstances and targeting resources to provide needed services.

Our position relating to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization has been guided by a set of principles developed about a year ago by the Texas Education Agency. These principles are applicable not only to the Act and the programs, but to other education initiatives as well. I would like to discuss a few issues related to those principles with you, and encourage you to

keep these in mind when deliberating the Federal impact on local education during the reauthorization process.

Issue. There is too much of a focus on process rather than performance. Too much valuable time is focused on compliance, particularly related to fiscal issues. This time would be better focused on issues of student achievement.

Recommendations. Any modifications to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act should be based on performance outcomes and should allow for maximum flexibility with strong accountability measures; should include accountability provisions measured in terms of student achievement results, not procedural and fiscal compliance; should empower education to devise effective solutions at the school district and campus level; should allow and even encourage flexibility and innovation.

Issue. There is too much of a focus on deficits, rather than strengths. There is a prevailing deficit model rationalization which suggests that there is something lacking in or wrong with unsuccessful students. The current law should not require schools to label students in order to appropriately serve them.

Recommendation: Any modifications to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act should focus on improvements which restructure schools to adapt to the needs of each student and build on students' strengths, so all students attain the same desired outcomes; should move away from or eliminate completely requirements which result in using negative labels such as educationally deprived or disadvantaged.

Issue: There is too much of a focus on segregation into separate programs, rather than integration into campuswide programs. The current law encourages practices that may lead to tracking of students. The law does not adequately encourage schools to explore strategies for improving the capacity of the general school program to ensure the success of all students.

The barriers between the categorical programs are too rigid. Schools are not provided opportunities to creatively and efficiently blend programs in a manner that results in equity and excellence for all students.

Recommendations. Any modifications to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act should address the negative effect of categorical programs which may limit their learning opportunities; should do more to encourage models, such as the Chapter 1 School-Wide Projects, which address the strengths and needs of all students on the campus. At a minimum, the law should be changed to reduce the poverty threshold from 75 to 50 percent for campus participation in schoolwide projects—should seriously consider allowing a clustering of categorical programs approach, whereby Federal funds continue to be allocated by separate programs, but the State is allowed to submit a plan to the Federal Government for approval to allow flexibility and coordination of funding to serve students with the same or similar needs. This cluster approach has been recommended by the Council of Chief State School Officers and the reauthorization of the Hawkins-Stafford Consortium of the Forum of Education Organization leaders.

Issue: There is too much focus on norm reference rather than criterion reference evaluation in current programs.

Recommendation: Any modification to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act when considering the assessment, should be based on world-class outcomes; should be extended to include real-world outcomes rather than solely based upon traditional academic subject areas; should be teacher-friendly and parent-friendly—promoting excellent communication between home and school and providing an avenue for improving instruction; should eliminate norm-referenced tests requirements entirely.

Issue: There is too much focus on symptoms rather than systemic causes and solutions.

Recommendations: Any modifications to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act should increase the emphasis on professional development as a tool for engendering systemic change, including funding for the State, intermediate and local levels to assist staff in reconceptualizing and restructuring schools, programs and practices; should increase the emphasis on collaboration and coordination with other social service programs, including funding to promote initiatives, such as school-based collaborative efforts.

Issue: The current funding mechanism are insensitive to changes in populations and differences between States. The Chapter 1 Formula funds the largest program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and is used as a basis for many other Federal Education programs. Currently, the Chapter 1 Funding System is based on the 10-year census. For rapid growth areas of the country, the formula inhibits effective allocation of resources. Currently, the Chapter 1 Funding System does not adequately consider the different amounts spent on education by the States. The poorer States, therefore, are adversely effected.

Recommendations: Any modifications to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act should seriously consider the proposed changes to the excellent and much appreciated Chapter 1 formula incorporated in H.R. 1453 and introduced by Congressman Gene Green of Houston; should consider not waiting for the reauthorization process and pass legislation similar to the most critical part of Congressman Green's proposal, which provides for an annual update of the number of poor students in the formula. We cannot afford to wait even another year to resolve this inequity.

In summary, Federal support for education has made a tremendous difference for millions of students. There is more to do. The focus of any reform or restructuring must be based on student learning for all students that is not negotiable. Real world, world-class outcomes, encouraging flexibility and innovation, strong accountability, where the bottomline is performance results. An effective Federal, State and local education partnership must involve top-down support for bottom-up reform.

The recommendations mentioned above for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, though developed separately are very closely aligned to the recommendations of the Commission on Chapter 1 in their document entitled Making Schools Work for Children in Poverty. The document may prove useful to Congress as a description of a way of addressing the issues presented today.

I encourage you to take advantage of the Elementary and Secondary Education reauthorization, to consider sweeping and new and bold changes. It offers an excellent opportunity for the Federal

78-432 0 - 94 - 2

Government to help the States, the school districts and the school campus to direct the attention of our Nation to a new vista—to attain a real world, world-class outcome for every student, and the promise and hope this offers for America in the coming century.

Thank you.

[Applause.]

Mr. GREEN. I would like to thank each of our panelists.

I would like to brag a little bit on some of the things the State of Texas has done since the 1984 dropout rates, which are an example that two of you have addressed. The problem in Texas has lowered our number of dropouts. We have a long way to go. When I was at Jeff Davis in 1965, half of the students did not complete it. I know there is a great deal of effort and success around the State because of the efforts being made. Hopefully, we can use Chapter 1 ultimately to do that.

There are good examples of business/education partnerships. Jeff Davis High School is a good example of that. Tenneco has been working with this high school, like a lot of major businesses have with other schools. We have it all over HISD, all over ISD, in a lot of our school districts. That is something that is relatively new in education in the last 5 or 6 years. We have seen a great deal of growth in that.

Let me just ask one question, and I will turn it over to Congresswoman Woolsey. One of the big debates we see in Congress, in the President's Goals 2000, along with the reauthorization of Elementary and Secondary Education Act is that to set high goals for our children, while recognizing that not all children have the same capabilities. How do we establish these high goals, while not setting up some children for failure? I know each of you addressed a little bit of that in recognizing the individual child. Do you have some response to that that we can take back with us to Washington?

Mr. NUNEZ. I believe that one of the things that we fail to recognize is the student's home environment or background. That is why I wanted to share my personal story. I think too many times, you know, we do not understand completely, if you have not had the opportunity to live it yourself or been around it, the problems that students bring to the school, to the classroom, obviously, probably in higher numbers—the have-nots, the minority child; the child that happens to come from another country, not only just Mexico, but from all over the world. I understand you have a number of students here in Houston ISD, from all over, a number of languages. They come with a tremendous handicap.

One of the things that bothers me so much in being a member of the State Board of Education is that even though we, as educators obviously would like the highest possible standards for our educational system and for our teacher preparation, we do not take into account all that goes on before they get into the classroom. I would like to see more emphasis on that.

Probably the biggest success that I have seen, and one of the programs I truly endorse is Head Start, because Head Start does that. They go out, they do outreach, they do home visits. They look into the health problem of the student and work with the parent, mandate parental involvement, even if it is a single parent. If we could

take the Head Start model, congressman and just kind of carry it through, I think we would improve a whole lot.

Ms. SALAS. I would just like to add a couple of things on that. I think, and this comes partially from the feedback that we have gotten at the Governor's office, it also comes partly from years of experience that I have had myself in teaching both regular education and special education in Austin. I currently am also an adjunct professor at the University of Texas, where I am training teachers to work with students in special education. One of the biggest problems I think teachers consistently address is the issue of documentality. I think when we start talking about goals, when we give a goal to a school or a set of goals to a teacher, or a teacher develops a line of goals for a student, what happens is there is an automatic operationalization of those goals. We have to know how to achieve those goals. So, what we do is we set up these definitive lists of behaviors that are going to say if you do these behaviors you have accomplished that goal.

I think that what we need to consider is that the list should not be so definitive. It should not be so stringent. It needs to be lenient, because, in my mind, in having worked 9 years in special education, I think high standards and high goals are still attainable by these youngsters and these students and these adolescents; we just go about them in a different way.

The problem in special education was how can I show the school that that is what I am doing when they have given me this list of criteria by which I am supposed to demonstrate that and it is not on this list?

So, I think, as we look at how to operationalize our goals, we need to keep in mind some flexibility of how we define attainment of those goals. Mr. Cummings, when he was speaking to real world outcomes and performance measures of that sort, I think those are the kinds of thinking and thoughts that need to be put into not only how we are going to implement the goals, but how are we going to document them and show that they are actually being attained by students of diverse backgrounds, of diverse capabilities, as well. I think that might be an important factor.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Congressman Green, and Congresswoman Woolsey, we take the position that, unless there is neurological brain damage, all of our children are capable of learning what we are able to teach effectively. So, in our quest for excellence and equity, we try to be very clear about that—that what we are presenting is the attempt to move everybody toward a program with great rigor, and we expect everybody to master that program, in terms of the results at the end of the pipeline, which feature graduation, and we expect there to be no differences among student groups. We expect to wipe out all of that. Currently there are great differences. There are great disparities in terms of the results. We think that some of those things can be corrected by some of the initiatives that we have in place.

One of the things that we feature and talk about all of the time is the ability to accommodate the local needs by allowing flexibility for them to use fund sources, as I mentioned in the testimony. Some of the things that we have going on to try to effect that kind of an outcome are the partnership school initiatives, where we are

relying on local districts to help us define appropriate ways to take the one negotiable in our equation, which is the program, to allow the non-negotiables to be realized. That is, to take the non-negotiable of the student to the non-negotiable result. That is what we are trying to move forward with.

The other thing is we have a number of initiatives. This is an alliance school, for example, where we are working with a community organization to try to effect the kind of institutional renewal that will move students toward the desired results.

We have, under the elementary, middle, and high school divisions that we have created, networks that are growing up around many schools that have put into practice some of these exciting programs that are delivering students to the results. We are trying to build on those kinds of efforts. That is why we seek the flexibility and the funding to be able to use funds in a way that makes sense for all the students on a given campus and a given school district.

We believe that there is strength in diversity. What we have to be mindful of as professionals—that we have to continue to grow in our ability to tap those strengths and bring them to the forefront.

The adaptations of schools is one of the areas we feel as though we have a major responsibility to do something about. I will just mention one of the things in that whole scheme of things. In the adaptations that the school can make to families and communities, we can be much more mindful of the kind of traditional barriers that exist in places called school. I talk about these by describing what I call the two by four by six by nine by 12 syndrome. If we can apply local flexibility to do something about that syndrome, I think we have the launching pad for some of this innovation and creativity. The two stands for the front and the back of the textbook, where we still continue to get most of the content. The four stands for the four walls in the school where most of education takes place. We know that there is a lot to be learned outside of school. The six stands for the six periods in most of the secondary schoolday—the six equally timed periods. We have a lot of flexibility with time that we need to use more effectively to get at this diversity. The nine speaks to the months of the year in which we hold school, and the belief that there may be something wrong with children—deficit in my own thinking, if it takes them longer than those time constraints to achieve what we expect of them. Then, of course, the 12 years which have been around for years as an expectation for those kids who are proceeding normally through the traditional education pipeline to graduation.

We have to reconstitute our thinking about those things to get at the kind of flexibility that we need locally to address the needs of excellence and equity. I think we have in Texas started down that road. So, we are requesting that we be given the assistance from the Federal level, with the new flexibility of the fund sources.

Mr. GREEN. I will just make one comment, and then answer one of the concerns I have and neither of you have addressed it—is that the inclusion of Chapter 1 with the English—the language—the LEP children—the Language Limited English Proficiency children, to make sure they are under Chapter 1. We have heard testimony

in Washington. About 2 months ago we had a national convention in Houston, and that was one of the big concerns nationwide. I have talked with a lot of professionals who say, well, they believe they are already in Chapter 1. Could you just tell us, whether it be in the State or, if we need to spell that out to make sure those children are also served, even though we also have a different chapter of the law for bilingual—that those children also need to be served as Chapter 1 children?

Mr. CUMMINGS. My position on that is that rather than add additional requirements, that we need to take away anything that prevents a local school or school district from determining that as a very basic need for them to move the agenda. If they decide that that is the way they need to spend the Chapter 1 moneys, then it ought to be open to their local decisionmaking. The addition of guidelines and opinions about how to do that imposed from the State kind of get in the way with the way we are trying to proceed with the renewal of the Texas schools. We would expect that that may be a problem for areas where they have chosen to go another way, from using a fund source to bring services to the designated proficient students. Because the whole accountability process suggests that we move all students to the desired result, the accountability then is applied at the front-end and the back-end, and not in terms of the kind of compliance with program procedures, that has been the history of our Federal legislation.

So, I would kind of fall down on the side of increase the flexibility rather than limit the flexibility, and let the local decisionmaking prevail.

Mr. NUNEZ. I sort of agree with Commissioner Cummings. My problem is, in my travels and my experiences with education, I do not know if I trust, for the lack of a better word, that funds dedicated to bilingual or English proficiency, or special programs are always used the way they are supposed to be used, appropriated correctly. I say that because—maybe the need is so great and it is so specific in many areas that, if the local support is not there and the local involvement is not there from administration to the school board, itself, sometimes there can be misuse of those funds. So, I caution you when you address that issue.

I can tell you that migrant education has done wonderful things with its appropriations. I have served for 5 years now on the Interstate Education Migrant Council. It is a Council of 17 member States. We meet three times a year, most of the time in Washington, DC. We support migrant issues at the congressional level. It has a way of keeping you informed and asking you for support. We see the money coming back to the State level and then to the district level. I have seen the results, because we are constantly aware and we are constantly keeping you aware. Even though there are very basic guidelines to it, the job is getting done. I caution you in flexibility.

Ms. SALAS. I generally concur with Mr. Cummings. I feel that one of the things we might want to keep in mind too is to look at how LEP students are identified in the schools. That is a rather cursory format that that is done in. Limited English Proficient students are identified by a three-question or four-question questionnaire that is sent out to every student. I recall very well the prob-

lems with getting those back and sometimes the erroneous kind of information that is obtained from them. For that reason, and because of reasons such as taking the lower 25th percentile of students and putting them in Chapter 1, and seeing a variety of other ways in which Chapter 1 students were identified, I tend to feel that individual schools and school districts tend to know what their students need, what their population require. I would like to see some flexibility in who are referred to Chapter 1 and how they are referred to Chapter 1; and not only in the referral of students to Chapter 1, but also in the programming that takes place in Chapter 1.

I spoke earlier about the pull-out and the inefficiencies of that and that we would like to see more, instead of separation of special programs; but programming going on in the regular classroom. Limited English Proficient students, yes, would benefit from intense one-on-one, small group instruction in specifically, the language that they are more proficient in or dominant in perhaps, with a teacher who is proficient in that language. There are other programs that are going on out there too that show that teachers who go into the actual classroom and work as a co-teacher with the regular education classroom teacher, then not only work on skills that are involved in reading and math, but then it generalizes and transfers into social studies, into science, and into higher-level thinking skills, more abstractions, rather than a rote type of learning, sitting down, doing paperwork, doing the lecture.

I would like to see more flexibility in the programming. I think that can only happen with the flexibility in the funding as well.

Mr. GREEN. Thank you.

Congresswoman Woolsey.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Thank you. I want you to know how impressed I am with this panel. You are so knowledgeable and your recommendations are right on target. Believe me, I am listening. Rene Nunez, I want to compliment you on your sharing with us. I knew when your voice changed that you were going to talk about something that was very meaningful to you. It leads me to want to tell a story of my own.

Twenty-five years ago I was a single mother, working, three children, and I was on welfare. It was no fault of my own, and it was certainly no fault of my children that we were in a really tight, terrible situation in our life. My children were 1, 3 and 5 years old. While I was going through that part of my life, I always knew how very very fortunate I was. One, I was educated, I had 2 years of college; two, I could speak English; and three, I was a very assertive person. I knew that even though I knew things were bad in my life.

Since then, of course, I have three college graduates in my family, et cetera, et cetera. That has a lot to do with where I am as a representative in my district and in this country, because I lived an experience that never goes away even though it was 25 years ago. So, thank you for your experience because I know that has a lot to do with what you are doing in your life.

I want to ask the three of you about coordinated services. That is not the only thing I think is important in education. I ran for the House of Representatives because I want education to be the

number one priority in this country. I know that, when I was a single parent, if services had been available at the school site or close to the school site, my life and my children's lives would have been so much easier.

How do you think we are going to be able to integrate this? We already have the language in the President's Goals 2000 reform. Eight-five percent of the language I recommended is part of that bill. I really feel wonderful about that. It will be no good if it is not funded. So, do you think we should fund coordinated services within Chapter 1? Do you think that is going to be possible, or will it just be something we talk about and we will not be able to afford to do anything with? I ask each of you if you could comment.

Mr. CUMMINGS. A couple of comments. The State, under House Bill 7, has kind of laid the pavement, so to speak, for coordinated services, through their efforts to do co-location. What I think we would need in terms of any assistance, is the opportunity to use the moneys in concert with the State effort, to bring about the co-location or the one-stop shopping so to speak, so that we would have the full array of services available to students, to keep them in the safety net, so that their needs are met—the needs that promote success in school.

The difficulty that we seem to be having in the State is that there has emerged kind of a movement against some of the positive aspects of coordinated services. What we have been trying to do is to establish again that local decisionmaking around these services that would be provided in this kind of concept, so that there is full public disclosure, so that local decisionmaking prevails, in terms of what you provide and what you do not provide, and so that people have the option of opting out, if they decide that that is something they do not want to participate—while, at the same time, being fully aware of the fact that we have any number of students who need things like immunizations, who need things like available health care, who need things that would keep them healthy and in a state of wellness to be able to avail themselves of the school.

Again, by moving the State in directions, and these things that are even being discussed along with the School Finance Bill, we have been talking about, as an example, a move toward the human investment—Council by the name of Education and Economic Competitiveness Council—Competitiveness Council—that is the bill before our legislature now to try to bring into concert all of those agencies that have some stake in human and health and education services. So, it would be a great benefit for us to have that as part of Federal legislation; but again, with the ability to use it in ways that are determined locally.

Ms. WOOLSEY. See, I see coordinated services as expanding to childcare—before and after school childcare, so a youngster can feel safe before school and have a safe place after school, and counseling services, I mean, beyond, and, of course nutrition.

So, you said that there are groups who are negative toward this. Are you——

Mr. CUMMINGS. Without trying to categorize them, I think there are some people who have some concerns about what would be involved in something that is associated with health services. That is a real issue before our board. I will let Mr. Nunez address that.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Nunez.

Mr. NUNEZ. This was brought by the Governor's office, so I am going to let you go first.

Ms. SALAS. Obviously, there are differences of opinion on this. As I was jotting down, some of the things I was jotting down was childcare, which, again, locally and individually, some schools because of creativeness, because of collaboratives, because of their ability to use their own local funds in more diverse ways, do provide—there are some schools that are currently providing that. I would relish the thought that we would have additional funding through Chapter 1, to support similar kinds of programs, not just at some, but at all schools that require that. We have so many teen pregnancy programs that are already in place in high schools, and what a better alternative then to have in these settings also childcare, where the young mothers do not have to worry about that and can concentrate on their schooling.

I also had jotted down counseling. Counseling because—the role of the counselor in most schools for personal counseling generally the referrals—you get a large amount of referrals from special education services as a supplemental. That takes up a lot of time in the counselor. I would like to see that be expanded to students that just would like and need some sort of counseling, either to benefit them as being more positive in their attitude toward themselves, to help them in problem solving certain problems they might be encountering. Those are two things that I, myself, also have been very adamant about. I think you see them taking place in some places.

Chapter 1 funding, again, that would help to support that, to me, would be wonderful. There are other initiatives that we do have and there are other places where we could get money. There are some collaboratives with Health and Human Services where we can get additional funding. I think the more money we have to put into these types of services, the better for us.

Some of the negativism for this comes from—and I do not know how else to put it but blatantly—people's perception of this is learned helplessness. If we provide them with these kinds of services and they do not learn how to take care of things on their own, then—and I am quoting that from several letters that we have received in the Governor's office, where that was the type of attitude that some people have about providing these kinds of services to youngsters in high school—that the family, you know, needs to be independent and should be able to solve these problems on their own. I think there will always be that kind of a debate. I do not think that the majority of us feel that way, and I know a lot of our lawmakers do not, and are working toward the opposite ends of that.

Mr. NUNEZ. Let me say that I do support interagency services that—the districts—the 26 county districts that I represent, the majority of them are on the Texas/Mexico border. Those services are extremely important to that population—to that student population. I also support the Governor's office. The Governor's office came out with a recommendation for a large program for interagency collaboration. As Commissioner Cummings mentioned, the State Board of Education was to proceed with hearings and contin-

uous support. We got a lot of heat from it. The heat came from a number of groups; but basically from what you might call right wing religious organizations, feeling that we were mixing student education and services and we should not. You have heard them all. I do not need to elaborate on that.

The fact of the matter is, in many cases on the border, a single parent, again, might not have transportation, might not have the extra funding to see the local doctor, might not have the knowledge just to understand what it takes to raise the whole child. So, it is extremely important, and I support that.

To the students that are here in the audience, thank you for sharing your story and mine. I think that many of you fall into this category. It just shows you that if you got gannos you are going to make it—if you really have it you are going to make it. Do not ever be discouraged.

[Applause.]

Mr. GREEN. I would like to thank this panel for your attendance. I know, as each of you go back to Austin, our prayers are with the legislature as June 1 approaches. Having served 20 years in the legislature representing this community and the areas north, I hope that the legislature can solve the problem. I will have to admit, I am glad I am in Congress to deal with Chapter 1 instead of the equity issues that are coming.

I appreciate your testimony today and look forward to continuing to work with you.

Ms. SALAS. Thank you.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Thank you.

Mr. NUNEZ. Thank you.

[Applause.]

Mr. GREEN. Our next panel—and we are going to take just a short break, as our next panel is coming up—is Mr. Frank Petruzielo, HISD Superintendent; M.D. Donaldson, Superintendent of Aldine ISD; and also Ms. June Smith, Chapter 1 Educator at Cage Elementary, which, by the way, is also in the 29th District.

[Applause.]

[Recess.]

Mr. GREEN. Our first panel was statewide officials, and our next panel are local education officials—the Superintendent of HISD, Houston School District, Frank Petruzielo; Superintendent from Aldine Independent School District, the second largest school district in the county, M.D. Donaldson; and, again, Ms. June Smith, a Chapter 1 teacher at Cage Elementary.

If we like, we could start from right to left, my right to left. Superintendent Donaldson.

STATEMENTS OF FRANK PETRUZIELO, SUPERINTENDENT OF HOUSTON ISD; M.D. DONALDSON, SUPERINTENDENT OF ALDINE ISD; AND JUNE SMITH, CHAPTER 1 EDUCATOR, CAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Mr. DONALDSON. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to be with you today and to present some ideas that our staff have developed. I will try not to be redundant with Commissioner Cummings' comments, because we share many of the same statements that I want to make this morning.

We have experienced a funding situation that I want to present to you this morning. We were funded, from the 1990 through the 1993 school year based on the 1980 census. We have just been notified that our funding is going to increase a little over two and a half times with Chapter 1 money because of using the 1990 census. I do not know, Gene, if that is because of your drawing attention to the fact that we had a problem area; but we certainly appreciate that. I think that is one area that we need to consider in the next 10-year cycle when it comes up—that funding is not delayed.

We feel that a more efficient way is needed to update the number of families below the poverty level than just the October count that is done by the Department of Human Services. What we are suggesting is a second census being done in the spring of the year with the use of the technology in our schools. We will be able to do that and then we will be able to start September with more current numbers as to receive our funding.

The percentage of schoolwide projects should be lowered from the 75th percentile, and we would recommend to the 60th. I know Commissioner Cummings recommended the 50th. We would support that; but we feel that the 60th percentile is appropriate. We could serve all of the students. All of the teachers could be trained using Chapter 1 funds. If you have a school that is 60 percent identified as being at the poverty level, you have a climate on that campus that is pervasive in all areas. We feel that it would be to the benefit of all of the students to implement those Chapter 1 programs on a schoolwide basis there at that level.

We could also work with the parents—parent involvement, teaching parents how to be parents would be very important, if that percentage was lowered from the 75th percentile to the 60th or the 50th.

We think that the success of the Chapter 1 program should be based on a preponderance of evidence and not just based on solely the outcome of achievement tests. We think there are other ways to measure student successes—teacher recommendations, levels tests that we currently have, classroom performance. We would recommend that we get away from the normal curve equivalent for the evaluation of such a program.

I think you have heard the word flexibility here this morning mentioned time and time again. We have, in Texas, been moving in that direction for a number of years now. I am confident that principals and teachers and parents on campuses can develop programs to meet the individual needs of those students. I think there ought to be standards. I think we ought to be held accountable. I believe, if we have staff that can develop those programs that will meet the individual needs of students, some flexibility is a very important word as we get into the Chapter 1 program.

With those comments, Gene, I would just like to say, because of the increased funding that we are going to realize next year in Aldine, we are going to be able to serve 26 schools as opposed to 15 that we served last year. That is a significant difference, and we are appreciative of that.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Petruzielo.

Mr. PETRUZIELO. Good morning and welcome to the Houston Independent School District. We are really delighted that you are

here. I hope you would give me the opportunity to recognize a couple of our school board members who are in the audience and came to hear these deliberations. Mr. Arthur Gaines is here, as well as Mr. Felix Fraga.

[Applause.]

Mr. PETRUZIELO. We also have one of our elementary school principals, from Turner Elementary who wears another hat as a member of the State Board of Education, Dr. Allen.

[Applause.]

Mr. PETRUZIELO. Congressman Green, I want to thank you and Congresswoman Woolsey and your staffs for inviting us to share our thoughts and recommendations on reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and how it affects bilingual education and programs for disadvantaged children, not only in the Houston Independent School District, but also in other urban school systems with similarly high concentrations of these youngsters.

HISD, the Nation's fifth largest school district, and Texas' largest system, with nearly 200,000 students, is a good example of the significant benefits derived from Federal ESEA allocations. Approximately 66 percent of our elementary student population, 74,400 students are currently provided supplemental instruction and enrichment through Chapter 1 funding, while districtwide, approximately 23 percent, or 45,000 youngsters have limited English proficiency and receive bilingual instruction.

We are growing by nearly 1,500 students per year. We anticipate continued growth in the numbers of disadvantaged and bilingual students served primarily because Houston is a thriving, economically diverse international center, in close proximity to Mexico and other Latin American countries.

The need for Federal funding to provide for the special instructional needs of our underprivileged students cannot be overstated. It is crucial that these children receive the specialized instruction and support made possible through ESEA in order to be able to compete and to contribute in our society.

In direct response to a point that was made earlier by Congresswoman Woolsey, we actively are endorsing and supporting and, wherever possible, piloting the notion of full-service schools. That initiative is designed to take school buildings and to use them, not only for educational purposes, but for health purposes, for counseling purposes and to meet those kinds of needs and to address those kinds of needs, not just for youngsters, but their families as well.

We are also encouraging you to support and link up the Learning bill with what the National School Board Association has advanced. We believe that that bill will create the models for entrepreneurship that will in fact encourage institutions of higher learning, city and county government, school districts, and community-based organizations and agencies to work together to solve problems.

We know that our programmatic success can and should be more widespread across the district, because we should be reaching more of our eligible students and providing them with additional resources and instructional support. Unfortunately, as you know, the current funding allocation for Texas is based on 13-year-old census

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

data that do not at all reflect our current population makeup. Consequently, many eligible students remain unserved.

For that reason, we wholeheartedly support Congressman Green's efforts to alter the formula for distribution of Federal funding through legislation that he has introduced—the Equal Education Funding Act. It is not acceptable for our children and our community to be denied their fair share of Federal funds. Any formula for allocating the available resources must take into account the needs of our current student population.

In order to assure that all eligible students receive appropriate services from federally-funded programs, we agree with Congressman Green, that population figures should be updated annually. Texas and Houston cannot continue to lose essential dollars that would enable us to meet the critical needs of our students. As you know, we are currently losing $120 million a year statewide, and nearly $10 million in my district alone.

Beyond ensuring equity of disbursement, ESEA programs should also move away from the current regulatory compliance-heavy framework that perpetuates the status quo, perpetuates bureaucracies and has a chilling effect on school and school district entrepreneurship.

Educators working within broad Chapter 1 guidelines at the campus level, should be empowered to focus their energy, their time and their talent on locally developed innovations for improving student performance, rather than on regulatory compliance and cost accounting. Too often, the structural and ministerial aspects of these programs have totally obscured their original intent. Currently, districts must use pull-out programs to serve students eligible for Chapter 1 services, so that they can document that the services supplement regular instruction rather than supplant it. This practice stigmatizes children and results in disjointed instruction for all students.

HISD's 70 schoolwide Chapter 1 programs allow each school's planning team, principals, teachers, parents, business partners, to effectively meet the needs of all students enrolled in the school without arbitrarily isolating students according to eligibility criteria. This option could be made available to all of our Chapter—all of our 140 Chapter 1 schools, if the cut-off was lowered from 75 percent low-income to 60 percent.

We support the kind of flexibility in programming and collaboration that schoolwide programs provide and would like to see that same kind of flexibility applied to all federally-funded programs. In that regard, districts should be able to consolidate ESEA funding from individual programs, such as Chapter 1 and bilingual wherever feasible and wherever possible, so that students' needs can be wholistically met, rather than in a fragmented manner that, again, emphasizes compliance rather than results.

We also encourage you to support additional Federal funding for meeting the critical needs of immigrant students. National policy on immigration needs to be viewed, in my opinion, as one of the most significant unfunded mandates that exists in our country today. These youngsters and their families have a variety of needs that go beyond language acquisition, to include counseling, acculturation and parent education. Intensive language development in

both native language and English is required for many immigrant students who are beyond the elementary school level, but who come to us literate in neither English nor their native language.

School districts deserve targeted assistance to meet the needs of the large numbers of immigrant children and their families who settle in States and urban areas with large immigrant populations. Immigrant impact funds would enable us to meet immigrant families' personal, social and educational needs—to buy appropriate instructional resources in Spanish for older students, and to allow us to effectively attract and train bilingual people to serve as secondary teachers, who not only are subject matter experts, but also can teach in Spanish.

HISD has already had considerable success with its bilingual and migrant program, supported under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. As one example, the results of our Spanish Assessment of Basic Education, SABE, test results, they are the State's best. They show consistent gains over the past several years. Improving these scores demonstrates that our Spanish-speaking students are mastering the course subjects, math, reading and writing, while they are making the transition to an all-English learning environment.

The ESL and bilingual components of ESEA also yield what some may consider intangible results, such as improving students' self esteem, and increasing respect for different cultural heritages. Other benefits come in the form of increased attendance, academic improvement, and a greater level of participation in scholastic activities on the part of the students involved.

We believe that these successes can and should be extended to eligible secondary students, and that strong consideration should be given to this issue in the ESEA reauthorization debate.

Your subcommittee is also addressing federally-funded vocational programs. We are encouraged by Congress' renewed emphasis on vocational education, because school-to-work transition is one of our school district's and one of our board of education's major system priorities. In fact, our existing vocational education efforts are being totally restructured to address that priority.

Regardless of whether our students do pursue a vocation or to continue their education, each must be thoroughly prepared to survive and to thrive in the 21st century workplace. We can achieve a fully-employable roster of graduates if we lay the groundwork through close alliances with the business community, with institutions of higher learning, with city and county government, and with community-based organizations and agencies. Through such collaboration, every one of our students must develop specific marketable skills to meet the growing demands of the business world and, at the same time, to fulfill their individual aspirations and potential.

As both of you know, the concerns of Houston and of HISD are very much like those of the Nation's other large urban areas. In many ways, we are a microcosm of the United States. Our citizens and our student population literally represent cultures from every continent and nation on the face of the earth. With a new Federal commitment to public schools, reflected in initiatives, such as Congressman Green's Equal Education Funding Act of 1993, we can ac-

complish our mission of preparing every student to successfully compete in the highly-competitive global marketplace of the 21st century.

Thank you for your time and attention.

[Applause.]

Mr. GREEN. Ms. Smith is a Chapter 1 teacher. I particularly appreciate your being here today and testifying.

Ms. SMITH. Thank you, Congressman Green.

As you know, I am an elementary teacher, and I thought I should begin by giving you a little on my background. I am a part-time staff representative of the Houston Federation of Teachers. I have been teaching with HISD for 15 years, 12 of which have been spent at my present campus, Cage Elementary. I am very proud of that. Six of those years I was a classroom teacher, and 6—these final 6, I am a Chapter 1 teacher. Of those 6 years, I was a coordinator with the Chapter 1 program and using a dual role as a teacher. So, I think I am probably qualified to give you a fairly clear picture of how Chapter 1 functions on our campus level.

My school is 97 percent Hispanic, with about 96 percent of our entire student body receiving free or reduced-lunch, which is one of the criterion that is utilized to determine the eligibility of a school campus to receive Chapter 1 funding. The other criterion used is, as Mr. Petruzielo has mentioned, the test scores, particularly looking at the areas of language, mathematics and reading.

When the program came on our campus about 7 years ago, we looked at grade equivalents, which meant that, if the child was tested in the third grade, sixth month of the year—if he scored 3 months or more below that grade level, he became eligible for Chapter 1 the next year. Then we went on to the percentile method of determining eligibility.

When we first got Chapter 1 at our campus level, we had one person to service the entire school, and she worked in the computer lab. It was an admirable task that was very challenging, to say the least. She simply could not do it. So, personnel was one of the things that we had a problem with. We did not have enough people to meet the need.

I joined the staff of Chapter 1 the next year, and along with me came five others. That gave us three other teachers, including myself, which made four, and two bilingual aides. We still were using the grade equivalent as a determining factor of who was eligible; but our school was growing at a tremendous rate. When we entered our building in 1983, we had about 545 students and, in 3 years, we had about three temporary buildings and were still bulging at the seams. So, consequently, we still could not meet all of our children's needs.

We tried to do so within the guidelines, but the guidelines, as Petruzielo and our Superintendent from Aldine has mentioned, simply limited us. They told us that we could work in small groups with eight children per teacher. If you had an age, you could raise your level to 15 per one—to one. It simply was not feasible because there were many many more students. If you had seven periods of the day, which we tried to have, to get as many students as we could serve, we still left a substantial number unserved.

We tried to compensate for that by having a Parent Involvement Committee, and we still have that. We use that time to work with the parents and teach them how to help their children at school. They work at home—they come in for a minimum of four meetings. We can have more, but at least four meetings are required of us. We teach them, through make-and-take workshops. We teach them the strategies or skills that the children will be meeting in the school year and tell them how they can help them at home. We assist them on good grooming, health, how to cook better, how to become a better parent. We try to meet all of those needs by pulling in our counselors and our one social worker that is on our staff. We try to pull as many people as possible in; but still, we cannot possibly meet every child's needs.

We also had teaching games. We had computers that we could put on loan; math language materials, reading materials for the parents to check out. This program was met with a lot of enthusiasm; but we did not have enough materials to go around to the students and parents that showed interest. Chapter 1 also gives us a limited amount of clothing vouchers to meet with the absenteeism rate.

At my school, at one time, we had over 1,100 children. We were at that time a schoolwide program—we are now; but, when we initially were there with five to 700-and-some students, we would get 112 clothing vouchers. Unfortunately it was on a first-come, first-served basis, so we still had a problem working with those needs.

The Chapter 1 program changed three years ago on my campus to a schoolwide. It became a little bit more beneficial, because the flexibility, as Petruzielo mentioned came in. That meant that all of the children in the school, whether it is a financial or an academic need, whatever it was, our staff could at least reach them.

Now, it also eliminated that pull-out program which we initially had that I think was good. That was a great idea. My feelings are strongly that, if we are going to have Chapter 1, you are going to have to consider getting the moneys available to us so that we can go into the classroom and reach the greater number. We need that for the materials as well as the teachers.

This year was unique with us. At the beginning of our school year we had over 1,100 children. On January 19, a new school, Cario, opened, and that reduced our population to 747 students; but, along with that, losing approximately 400 students, we had 10 teachers go to the new school, and also three of our staff. That hurt our program, in that we had initially set it up where we had a teacher for each grade level from K through five with three teachers leaving. We do not have the same personnel. Also, we had lost one of our aides because we had to compensate. Either you have the aide or you get another teacher to meet with the students, to give direct instruction.

I lost two of my seven fourth grade classes. Since one of the fifth grade teachers also left, I have now amended my schedule to work with two fifth grade classes and five fourth grade classes on a daily basis. I meet with approximately 145 students daily.

One of the reasons I see Chapter 1 is not as effective as it could be—each campus administrator translates the guidelines the way he sees it. Also, if we have to—if there is a clash, we have to bend

to the administration, because that is his school, and he is looking at his best needs. We understand that. We are trying to keep them within the guidelines so that we do not lose our funding. Because that is a great fear. You do not want to bend it so much that you end up losing the program. So, flexibility is definitely needed in Chapter 1.

Perhaps simplifying the guidelines might make it easier. If you blend it, then we will not have to worry about bending.

Another problem is consistency—consistency in what a Chapter 1 teacher is allowed to do. We are so worried about supplanting or supplementing or reinforcing—we are not real sure of what we can do sometimes. We are concerned because our main object is to help the child. If I supplant, so be it, if it helps him. I do not need that guideline where I have to worry that, oh, they are going to come down on me. We could lose it. It just frustrates the teacher, the classroom teacher, as well as the Chapter 1 teacher, and the Administrator as well.

Collaboration is a big key to a successful program in Chapter 1. I think it should be required that administrators, the traditional classroom teachers be bilingual or regular, since we service them all, and the Chapter 1 teachers should meet together and decide, as a group, what needs to be done for the best of the campus. Because that is what we are concerned with—our children. The bottom line is what helps our children. With the great influx that we have in Houston ISD of the Hispanic children and children that speak other languages, other than English as their first language, we have to come together to be successful. We are often told look at the test rates. They are not showing a growth. This is what the businesses tell us; but they do not take into consideration that we are working with greater problems than ever before.

Personnel choice is another thing that I think should be taken into consideration in Chapter 1. This is part of the guidelines that says I believe, if I am quoting it correctly, that a teacher should have at least 3 years' experience before entering the program as a teacher. Unfortunately, sometimes administrators use that as a dumping ground for the teachers that have problems. That should not be a choice. Because we do not use textbooks, we pull from our experience, our knowledge of methodologies and strategies that have worked for us in the classroom for us, because that is why I came out. I thought I could meet a greater number and do more good. A new teacher simply does not have the knowledge to pull from it; and so you end up having a frustrated teacher and a cheated student.

That is not to say that Chapter 1 overall is not effective. I work with bilingual students, I work with ESL students. My Spanish has improved greatly since I have been there. It is a give and take. I do not think we should separate it as much as we have. Our children do not do as well on our NAPT tests because we take too long in transitioning. Sometimes the transitioning is slowed down because the teachers, receiving a stipend that they need, or if they had a better pay scale, would not need—they are slower in transitioning the children. When you take too long to transition the children, they cannot possibly be expected to function well in English in the later school years, in middle school and high school. We

need to start earlier. I think, if we combine Chapter 1 with the English instruction, to work in collaboration with the bilingual education, we will see better success on an overall level.

The bottom line to me is to make the child the best that he or she can be, because they are our most important products. I do not think I can say enough about moneys. You can pay millions of dollars to a professional athlete and you justify it, and that is solely for enjoyment, yet you are not willing to allocate the moneys that we need to provide the children who will one day take our places? I do not think we have a choice. We need to make it now.

Thank you.

[Applause.]

Mr. GREEN. We had a subcommittee meeting yesterday, and our Chairman of the subcommittee, Chairman Kildee said a statement that I think all of us have heard in the Federal Government—we have never had to have a bake sale to buy a B–1 bomber.

Ms. SMITH. That is right.

Mr. GREEN. We have heard that for many years, and yet we have to have bake sales to support education. So, there are a lot of folks, not only here, but the Chairman of the subcommittee who agree with you.

One of the things we are talking about in Congress, and it has been a suggestion is that—for Chapter 1 to provide for additional staff development. Yesterday President Shanker suggested that the growth in new moneys on Chapter 1, that 20 percent of that be used for professional development or staff development. I was sharing it with the staff, and I said this in Washington a great many times—I talk to a lot of teachers even from Washington, but every weekend, and there is a lot of frustration with the classroom teacher over staff development. One, we need to provide additional staff development, and I recognize that, but also the quality of that staff development. Would either of you be as brief as possible, because I know, Superintendent Donaldson, you are supposed to go to a program at a middle school. Talk about the staff development and improvement, not just for maybe Chapter 1, but for all teachers, but Chapter 1 in particular.

Mr. PETRUZIELO. I could not agree more with Mr. Shanker on that. The fact of the matter is we do not do enough professional development and staff development for any of our professional staff. It represents what we spend on training. It represents such a small percentage of our budget that it is not even—I do not think you can even look at it as a serious expenditure. It shows. There is no private sector company in America that could survive or thrive in an environment where they did not make sure that their people had state-of-the-art training, state-of-the-art professional development. I do not know what the right percentage of any new revenue is for that; but I would strongly consider that, if there are going to be new dollars expended in this area, the time to think about staff development is not after the money is spent. The time to think about it is when it is being appropriated.

A second recommendation that I would make is, if staff development is going to be funded, do not make it the kind of staff development that people do for other people when they do not work with them on a daily basis. Make the money available so that the people

who are going to get the training decide the agenda. Let them, through needs assessments, determine what kind of training they need. Do not force districts to have to provide it all ways within the district, because sometimes we do not have the expertise to provide it within the district. If the guidelines are so specific—that you have to spend it within the system, then you may not be able to use that money in the most productive and economical and targeted way.

So, I think staff development is essential. I think you initiate a new program or expand an existing one that has worked, that there ought to be attention to staff development. I hope it would not be the same kind of staff development that we have had in years past, where people who do not work in schools decide what people in schools need to know. Train them, announce that the world is safe for democracy, and then leave the campus when the teacher is pretty much put in a posture where they go back and do it the way they were doing it before. Because it was relevant for them to begin with. Now, that is not a castigation or a criticism of people that do staff development because, in my district, we have some wonderful people that provide staff development. It is a mentality in terms of who decide what is staff development.

We have, as you know, every single one of our schools now has a school improvement planning process. We have used that opportunity for our schoolwide Chapter 1 programs and school improvement plans to be integrated with the entire program. As a part of those deliberations and discussions, the right place to talk about staff development, if there was some money that was available to spend on it is right there at the campus level.

Ms. SMITH. I agree with Superintendent Petruzielo. The better-prepared your teachers are, the better job they can do with the children. As he said, it is no great deal for us—for the grand puba over here, who has never seen a child in his life, come up with these glorified ideas of how it should be done, and the teachers go to the workshop and they come back and go right. It is not working in the real world. We need the workshops geared for the real world that we face daily.

Mr. DONALDSON. There are some wonderful programs out there that have recently been research-based that are excellent—A Success for All; but you cannot implement A Success for All program without the appropriate training of your teachers and principals and people who are going to implement this program. You cannot just read about it to implement it. You have to have hands-on experience, visit, site visitations, bring teachers in from other school districts that have implemented this program. This costs money. If it does not come from Chapter 1, where does it come from? Another part of your budget, that may already be squeezed.

Mr. GREEN. Thank you. I appreciate it.

Congresswoman Woolsey.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Something that has not been mentioned on either panel, and maybe it is because it is not a problem in Texas like it is in California, and that is class size. I mean, do you have a problem with class size, or have you just given up, or is it something you think that belongs to the State and not the Federal Government to address?

Mr. GREEN. Before we answer that, in 1984, on our kindergarten through four, we required no more than 22 to 1, although there is a waiver system. I know, from the school districts that are represented here today, it is a mandated 22 to 1 in the elementary school. Even in high school levels, because my wife teaches, and there has been a concerted effort to have smaller class sizes, even in high school; although, again, it is a budget problem. I know the effort by both HISD and Aldine to lower even the higher middle school and high school.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Well, then that is why I have not heard about it. When we go to California, Gene, you are going to hear a lot about class size.

Mr. GREEN. I sing the praises of lowering the class size.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Good.

Mr. GREEN. Even back then we said the 15 to 1 is ideal. When I first went to Washington last year, talking about Chapter 1, I was amazed at the pull-out programs. I do not like them. I met one teacher in HISD that liked the pull-out programs. That is why I like the idea of lowering it to 50 percent or 60 percent or whatever. My idea was to Lower Chapter 1 to 15 to 1, if we can come up with the money. Again, there is magic in numbers if we can get to that point.

Ms. SMITH. Congressman Green, that is very good. The way we do with ours, by going into the classroom, we use the traditional teacher as a team teacher. When I go in she stays there. If there are a small group of children who need maybe concentrated work and a concept that did not go over well, she uses that time and I take the other. The only disadvantage is that, if I am doing something that is extremely interesting, they have a tendency to turn to try to see what I am doing and vice versa. I think there is no ideal way to do it; but I feel that it is probably benefiting more children this way.

As far as the cap on the classroom, we still could do a little bit more with the fifth grade, because there is no cap. That is where we stop.

Mr. GREEN. Any other responses?

Mr. PETRUZIELO. One of the things that makes Texas different perhaps from California, and I know from Florida and other States, is the legislature has established class size limits. Those can only be waived by exception. That represents the single largest unfunded mandates that the legislature has ever implemented. That is one of the reasons that we are practically broke and are not able to offer all of the programs that we ought to be. Now, that does not mean that it is not a good policy. The problem is a good policy deserves good money. We—I think everyone supports low class size. Everyone knows, the research is clear, if we can reduce class size significantly, we can give kids a better education. That is a resource issue at the State level, and certainly at the Federal level as well.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Okay. Thank you.

Mr. DONALDSON. As to the class size issue, I have heard different numbers mentioned today--seven, eight. My teachers tell me 10. So, I do not know what we are talking about as far as class size for Chapter 1 programs. The comments that our teachers were

making to me was that we need to be flexible in the sense that there are some programs where you can benefit through mixing Chapter 1 students with non-Chapter 1 students, and yet, you exceed a certain number with class size, and you watch out, I cannot do that. I will get my hands slapped. This is the flexibility that I am referring to as to how those people make those everyday decisions in the building.

Mr. GREEN. Any other questions.

Ms. WOOLSEY. No. Thank you very much. This has been very informative today.

Mr. GREEN. I want to thank this panel. Before the panel leaves, I know we have some graduates today who will be graduating shortly from Jeff Davis. My daughter is a graduate this year too from high school. I can relate to the excitement that I also remember when I was sitting out there and sitting on this stage with my cap and gown from Jeff Davis.

I would like to thank Ms. Cole, the principal, and all of the students, and also HISD for hosting us here at Jeff Davis. In a few minutes, after we have the teacher appreciation luncheon here to recognize the teachers at Davis, we are going to go to a Chapter 1 school, Travis Elementary, over in the Heights, to talk with the teachers and the administrator and parents there. So, this is not the ending.

Before we adjourn, if there is anyone who would like to provide testimony, the record, without objection, of this hearing will remain open for 2 weeks, where that any additional testimony, if someone would like to present, whether it be a parent, a teacher or even a student, to make sure it is included.

These hearings are being held around the country. There were two last weekend, one in Michigan and one in Pennsylvania I believe, to gain information on how we can make Chapter 1 and Federal aid to education more responsive to our districts and not necessarily what maybe Washington believes, but what the people actually have to implement—like Ms. Smith, has to live with it and Superintendent Petruzielo, and Superintendent Donaldson.

I want to thank each of the panelists today, and also thank Jeff Davis High School. It is good to be home. Thank you.

[Whereupon, at 11:50 a.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

[Additional material submitted for the record follows.]

Lionel "Skip" Meno

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, I thank you for the opportunity to be before you to represent the Texas perspective regarding education and the pending reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) as amended by the Hawkins-Stafford Act of 1988.

The close alignment of ESEA programs with the current education reform initiative shows how necessary a comprehensive education agenda is for boosting student performance. In this spirit, I encourage you to make adequate use of the federal government's potential to promote educational equity and excellence for all students through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The federal government has significant influence on the course of public education in the United States.

- Nearly 10 billion dollars per year is appropriated for federal elementary and secondary education programs.
- Federal funds and federal requirements drive the efforts of thousands of teachers, administrators, and support personnel, resulting in millions of hours of effort.
- We can ill afford to direct these efforts in ways that fail to positively influence educational excellence and equity.
- Past federal efforts are to be commended for leveling educational opportunities for students with disadvantaged circumstances and targeting resources to provide needed services.

Our position relating to ESEA reauthorization has been guided by a set of principles developed about a year ago by the Texas Education Agency. These principles are applicable not only to the ESEA programs but other education initiatives as well.

I would like to discuss a few issues related to those principles with you and encourage you to keep these in mind when deliberating the federal impact on local education during the reauthorization process.

Issue:

There is too much of a focus on process rather than performance.

Too much valuable time is focused on compliance, particularly related to fiscal issues. This time would be better focused on issues of student achievement.

Recommendation(s):

Any modifications to the ESEA:

- should be based on performance outcomes.
- should allow for maximum flexibility with strong accountability measures.
- should include accountability provisions measured in terms of student achievement results not procedural and fiscal compliance.
- should empower education to devise effective solutions at the school district and campus level.
- should allow and even encourage flexibility and innovation.

Issue:

There is too much of a focus on deficits rather than strengths.

- There is a pervading deficit model rationalization which suggests there is something lacking in, or wrong with, unsuccessful students.
- The current law should not require schools to label students in order to appropriately serve them.

Recommendation(s):

Any modifications to the ESEA:

- should focus on improvements which restructure schools to adapt to the needs of each student and build on student strengths so all students attain the same desired outcomes.
- should move away from, or eliminate completely, requirements which result in using negative labels such as educationally deprived or disadvantaged.

Issue:

There is too much of a focus on segregation into separate programs rather than integration into campus-wide programs.

- The current law encourages practices that may lead to the tracking of students.

- The law does not adequately encourage schools to explore strategies for improving the capacity of the general school program to ensure the success of all students.

- The barriers between categorical programs are too rigid. Schools are not provided opportunities to creatively and efficiently blend programs in a manner that results in equity and excellence for all students.

Recommendation(s):

Any modifications to the ESEA:

- should address the negative effect of categorical programs which may limit student learning opportunities.

- should do more to encourage models such as Chapter 1 Schoolwide Projects which address the strengths and needs of all students on a campus. At minimum, the law should be changed to reduce the poverty threshold from 75% to 50% for campus participation as Schoolwide Projects.

- should seriously consider allowing a "clustering" of categorical programs approach whereby federal funds continue to be allocated by separate programs but the state is allowed to submit a plan to the federal government for approval. The approved plan would allow flexibility and coordination of funding to serve students with the same or similar needs. (This "cluster" approach has been recommended by the Council of Chief State School Officers and the Reauthorization of the Hawkins-Stafford Consortium of the Forum of Education Organization Leaders.)

Issue:

There is too much focus on norm-referenced rather than criterion-referenced evaluation in current programs.

Recommendation(s):

Any modification to ESEA when considering assessment:

- should be based on world-class outcomes.

- should be extended to include real-world outcomes rather than only traditional academic subject areas.

- should be teacher-friendly and parent-friendly, promoting excellent communication between home and school and providing an avenue for improving instruction.

- should eliminate norm-referenced test requirements entirely.

Issue:

There is too much focus on symptoms rather than systemic causes and solutions.

Recommendation(s):

Any modifications to ESEA:

- should increase the emphasis on professional development as a tool for engendering systemic change including funding for the state, intermediate, and local levels to assist staff in reconceptualizing and restructuring schools, programs, and practices.

- should increase the emphasis on collaboration and coordination with other social service programs including funding to promote initiatives such as school-based collaborative efforts.

Issue:

The current funding mechanisms are insensitive to changes in population and differences between states.

- The Chapter 1 formula funds the largest program under ESEA and is used as a basis for many other federal education programs.

- Currently, the Chapter 1 funding system is based on the decennial census. For rapid growth areas of the country, the formula inhibits effective allocation of resources.

- Currently, the Chapter 1 funding system does not adequately consider the different amounts spent on education by the states. Poorer states, therefore, are adversely effected.

Recommendation(s):

Any modifications to ESEA:

- should seriously consider the excellent and much appreciated proposed changes to the Chapter 1 formula incorporated in H.R. 1453 and introduced by Congressman Gene Green of Houston.

- should consider not waiting for the reauthorization process and pass legislation (similar to the most critical part of Congressman Green's proposal) which provides for an annual update of the number of poor students in the formula. We

cannot afford to wait even another year to resolve this inequity.

In summary:

- Federal support for education has made a tremendous difference for millions of students--but there is more to do.
- The focus of any reform or restructuring must be based on:
  - •• student learning for all students--its not negotiable
  - •• real-world, world-class outcomes
  - •• encouraging flexibility and innovation
  - •• strong accountability where the bottom-line is performance results.
- An effective federal, state and local education partnership must involve top-down support for bottom-up reform.

The recommendations mentioned above for ESEA, though developed separately, are very closely aligned to the recommendations of the Commission on Chapter 1 in a document entitled "Making Schools Work for Children in Poverty." The document may prove useful to Congress as a description of a way of addressing the issues presented today.

I encourage you to take advantage of the ESEA reauthorization to consider sweeping new and bold changes. It offers an excellent opportunity for the federal government to help the states, the school districts and school campuses to direct the attention of our nation to a new vista--to attaining real-world, world-class outcomes for every student and the promise and hope this offers America in the coming century.

○

ISBN 0-16-044178-1